

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,864	01/08/2002	Hiroaki Sato	000449.00010	6381
22907 75	590 08/26/2005		EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF			NGUYEN, DUC M	
1001 G STREET N W SUITE 1100		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001			2685	
			DATE MAIL ED: 08/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	·					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/038,864	SATO, HIROAKI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Duc M. Nguyen	2685				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 Ju	<u>ıne 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9-13,19-22,28-31,37 and 38</u> is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-3, 9-13, 19-22, 28-31, 37-38</u> is/are is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• . ,	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	· <u>_</u>					
1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/19/04.		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/038,864 Page 2

Art Unit: 2685

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 6/2/05. Claims 1-3, 9-13, 19-22, 28-31, 37-38 are now pending in the present application. **This action is** made final.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims **1-3, 11-13**, **21-22, 30-31** are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Vu** (US **6,185,436**) in view of **Tayloe** (US **5,987,325**).

Regarding claim 1, Vu discloses a mobile communication apparatus for communicating with a network selectively utilizing a plurality of IC units (SIM cards) which would include all the claimed limitations (see Abstract), comprising:

- a detector configured to detect each of IC units connect to the handset (see
   col. 3, line 15 col. 4, line 5, wherein it is clear that the electrical contact from
   the SIM card insertion would trigger a detection):
- an activator (executing program) configured to activate at least one IC as claimed (see col. 3, line 63 - col. 4, line 6);
- a controller (processor) configured to inform the network of data in the activated IC unit (see col. 3, lines 56-60).

Although Vu is silence on deactivating a non-selected IC, it is noted that such deactivating of a non-selected IC is just a standard practice and is known in the art as disclosed by **Taylor** (see Fig. 3 and **col. 5**, **lines 41-63**), for preventing receiving calls on non-selected SIM. Since Vu and Taylor are analogous arts, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the above teaching of Taylor to Vu for deactivating non-select IC as well, for deactivating a non-selected IC unit as claimed, for preventing the reception of unwanted calls associated with the non-selected IC units for cost saving (i.e, preventing undesired calls that incurs expensive roaming charges associated with non-selected SIM from being activated, executed and delivered to the user).

Regarding claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Vu** discloses two or more SIM cards can be activated concurrently in the handset (see col. 2, lines 18-20 and col. 5, lines 15-27).

Regarding claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Vu** discloses the initiate establishment as claimed (see col. 3, lines 56-63).

Regarding claims **11-13**, **21-22**, **30-31**, they are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1-3 above.

2. Claims **9-10**, **19-20**, **28-29**, **37-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Vu** in view of **Taylor** and further in view of **Hirsch** (US **6,085,08**).

Regarding claims **9-10**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7 above. In addition, **Vu** discloses the SIM data comprising a table of PLMN ID or cell ID (see col. 5, lines 5-10 and col. 8, lines 15-35), which would obviously comprise a home location code so that the preferred home PLMN can be selected for cost saving (i.e, avoid roaming charge). However, **Vu** is silent on the country code. However, it is noted that such country code is a component of the GSM specification as disclosed by **Hirsch** (see col. 2, line 60 - 67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the above teachings of Vu and Hirsch for providing a country code as claimed, so that a mobile station located in an overlap coverage area of two cells having different country codes would be able to select the cell providing the least cost, for cost saving such as avoid roaming charge.

Page 4

Regarding claims **19-20, 28-29, 37-38**, they are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 9-10 above.

## Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, 21, 30 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2685

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

## 5. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box A.F.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for

entry)

(571)-273-7893 (for informal or draft communications).

Art Unit: 2685

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893, Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Edward Urban (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-7899.

Duc M. Nguyen

Aug 8, 2005